



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

KOTTEK'S "DAS SECHSTE BUCH DES BELLUM JUDAICUM."

BY RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College, New York City.

DAS SECHSTE BUCH DES BELLUM JUDAICUM [SYRISCH], nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet von Dr. Hermann Kottke. Berlin: *Rosenstein & Hildesheimer*. 1886. 8vo. 30 pp. text, 45 pp. introduction and translation.

This little publication, with its rather ostentatious title, gives us the first two chapters of the Sixth Book of the *περὶ τοῦ ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου* of Josephus in a Syriac translation. The text is a copy of the same edited by Ceriani in his photolithographic edition of the P<sup>š</sup>iṭṭā.<sup>1</sup> We must be thankful to Dr. Kottek for placing this, in many respects, interesting translation within the reach of ordinary students. At the same time, we would recommend care in the use of Dr. Kottek's text in its present form. Had he collated his proof-sheets once more with the MS., he would have saved his readers much useless work. The text seems to be very negligently edited. S'yâmê points are at times placed, at times not; neither Wau 'aliṣṭâ nor Yûdh h'bhista are expressed. In the punctuation, taḥtâyâ and 'elâyâ are either not noticed at all, or confounded with zaugâ. Nor is this all. The copula Wau is omitted, an 'âlah placed for an Hê, Dê(i)n for Gê(i)r, and words misspelt in a most confusing manner. In texts of the age and worth of the Ambrosian P<sup>š</sup>iṭṭâ we have need of accurate diplomatic copies, such as those to which scholars like Lagarde, Sachau, Wright, etc., have accustomed us.<sup>2</sup> Further down I give a list of corrections, mainly made by collating again Ceriani's text. My own corrections I designate as such. I omit to note the errors in punctuation, in order not to swell the list unnecessarily.

The translation bears the superscription (fol. 679 [320 v.] inaccurately given by Dr. Kottek, p. 5) 𐤀𐤁𐤓 𐤏𐤕𐤔 𐤏𐤕𐤔 𐤏𐤕𐤔.

مقصدا . سوڀ ڪا [توڻوڪا؟] اسو . . . ا ڄو [سڀا؟] سڀا ڇا . [ڪا]  
سڀا اسڀا [اڻوڪا] ڇو ڀڄو سو [سڀا؟] سڀا ڇو [ڪا] .

<sup>1</sup> In the preface Ceriani speaks of his having edited the text of this Sixth Book in his *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, vol. V. I was unable to find this publication in any of the New York libraries. Prof. Lyon of Harvard University, to whom I turned for information, very kindly wrote to me (Sept. 11), "By reference to vol. V., fasc. I. of Ceriani's *Mon. Sac. et Prof.*, I find that book 6 (as far as I, 1-7) of Josephus' Jewish Wars is given in Syriac. The statement is made that the rest of book 6 would be in fasc. III., but this fasc. is not in the Harvard Library."

<sup>2</sup> The more so, since the editor himself (introd. p. 6) calls attention to the “accuracy and consistency” with which the points are placed. Had Dr. Kottek read a few more Syriac MSS., he would not have designated the two points placed under the third person feminine sing. of the Perfect as peculiar to this text. These two points, called m<sup>e</sup> pagg<sup>e</sup> dhānā (bridle), are peculiarly Nestorian. The Jacobites make use of two points, one underneath and the other above the final Tau; cf. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, § 7; Duval, *Traité de Grammaire Syriaque*, § 67.

The headings read (I correct without further mention the mistakes of Dr. Kottke): fol. 676 (328 v.) across this page and the next: (sic) **سَمْعَا وَشَعْبَا**  
**مُتَلَكِّمًا وَمُسْتَعِيبًا [فِي] سَبَابَةِ كَسَائِدٍ**; fol. 666 (323 v.) **وَمُسْتَعِيبًا وَمُسْتَعِيبًا**

Dr. Kottek is probably right in assuming that the superscription is not original; but not so in his rendering of the last heading. I should translate: "fifth treatise; (written) by Josephus." The mistake seems to be an old one. 'Abhdîšô' bar B'rîkhâ, speaking in his catalogue of Syriac books of the biblical and apocryphal writings, says :<sup>2</sup>

[illegible]

Evidently 'Abhdîšô' has understood the matter differently, making Josephus the author of the five treatises here mentioned. Counting the books of the Maccabees as one book, the "last destruction of Jerusalem" will be the fifth in order. Dr. Kottek is hardly right in speaking of this last as having been admitted into the Church Canon. Although the fourth book of the Maccabees occurs several times in biblical MSS.,<sup>5</sup> the Ambrosian is the only one containing the "last destruction of Jerusalem." Dionysius bar Šâlîbi (A. D. 1192), in his commentary on the Old and New Testament, says :<sup>6</sup>

سَلِّحْ بِي اَمْرِي بِمَسْعَدَتِ نَحْنُ وَامْرِفْ  
مَعْلَانِ خَرَّ قَوْصَا مَصْدَافِ اَلْمَنْشَى مَخْلَصٍ  
وَامْرَفْ صَارَ مَقْبُولًا حَكِّ سَوْنَةِ وَاْمْرِكُمْ عَزَّيْ.

I believe this to be the notice which has led 'Abhdîsô' astray. It seems probable that the whole of the sixth book of Josephus' "*Bellum Judaicum*" once existed in a Syriac translation, together with the so-called "fourth book of the

<sup>1</sup> On **מִצְוַת אֱלֹהִים** see Eusebius on the *Theophania*, ed. Lee, 4:20, 1. 10; 15:16, which Dr. Kottek (text, p. 30) cites, probably from Payne Smith's *Thesaurus*; as, otherwise, he would have seen that it contains an extract from Josephus, Bk. VI. See also *ibid.* 1. 40.

<sup>2</sup> *Bibl. Orient.* III., p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Hardly the Mišnâh, as Assemâni thinks. Perhaps the Pirkê âbôth. Cf. the beginning of tract. מס' = *מס' .* Badger (*Nestorians and their Ritual*, II., p. 362) gives an erroneous translation of this passage.

<sup>4</sup> *περὶ ἀλώσεως Ἰουδαίας*. Havercamp, II., p. 47, note a.

<sup>5</sup> See Zotenberg, *Catalogue des MSS. Syriaques*, etc., p. 3. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS.*, I., pp. 2, 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Bibl. Orient.*, II., p. 165. Cf. Bar 'Ebhrâyâ, *Chronicle, Syriacum*, p. 54.

Maccabees,"<sup>1</sup> early ascribed to Josephus. This would be the "taš'yâth b'nai Šemûni" of 'Abhdîšô'. The other items would cover the ground gone over by the sixth book of the "Bellum." See the scope of the same as laid down by Josephus himself in the preface, § 7. That the first part fell away, owing to the existence of the Maccabean books, is not surprising.

In the text I have noticed the following corrections:—p. 1: 1. 2, **חַבַּת**. 1. 5: The reading of the MS. **שִׁגְחָיָא**, i. e., sughâyâ, is correct. It occurs again in Walton's Polyglott, 2 Macc. VIII. 16. See Payne Smith, col. 2521. Targ. **סוּגִיָּא**; Levy, TW., II. p. 143, where **שִׁגְחָיָא** is a misunderstanding of Castell, p. 578. *ibid.* MS. **סג** for **סס**. 1. 6, MS. **שִׁגְחָיָא**. 1. 8, **סג**; above **סג** MS. shows the word **סג**. MS. **סג**. 1. 9: For **סג** of the MS. read **סג** *omen, sign* = κληδόν, not **סג** *divination*, as proposed in note c. 1. 11, MS. **סג**. 1. 13, MS. **סג** without Yûdh. The reading of the word rê(i)šâ is not always clear in old MSS. See Merx, ZDMG., xxxvii., p. 249. Even where it is so, one and the same MS. gives the word at times with, at times without the Yûdh. Note a, read **סג**.

p. 2: Read **סג**. 1. 5, **סג** is the correct reading. In the note appended to this word there is a strange confusion. **סג** is the exact equivalent of τὴν περὶ τὸ ἄστυ χώραν. Dr. Kotték is wrong (text, p. 30, Nachtrag) in assuming that the word denotes the inner portion of a city. Lee had already (Payne Smith, col. 36) translated correctly "in its borders." This rendering is supported as well by the passage in the Theophania of Eusebius, which is a free rendering of Luke XXI. 21, where our texts read **סג**, as opposed to the preceding **סג**, as it is by our passage here.<sup>2</sup> In the translation Dr. Kotték has given the proper meaning. I may add that the word **סג** occurs again in Hoffmann's Bar 'Alî (Kiel, 1874) p. 142:10, where **סג** has been changed from **סג**. 1. 6: The reading of the MS. is correct, i. e. **סג**; Cf. Prov. XXI. 26, where the Greek text has ἀφειδῶς. Payne Smith, col. 1223. 1. 7, MS. **סג**. 1. 8, MS. **סג**. 1. 9, MS. **סג**, **סג** for **סג**. 1. 11: Read **סג**, which may possibly be the reading of the MS. 1. 12, MS. **סג**.

p. 3: 1. 7, MS. **סג**. 1. 8, MS. **סג**. 1. 9, MS. **סג**. 1. 13: **סג** = δεξιὰ τὴν ἄλῃ; where the text, as it now stands, is entirely unintelligible. 1. 17, MS. **סג**. 1. 18, MS. **סג**. 1. 20: MS. **סג**, = πρὶν. See Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, glossary, p. 57. MS. **סג**. In the text we must read **סג** without S'yâmê, and omit note c. Dr. Kotték has

<sup>1</sup> περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> Josiphôn ben Gôrion (ed. Breithaupt, 1710), p. 809, כבינות ירושלים.

been misled by supposing ܡܕܒܠܬܐ to be feminine. George Karmseddinâyâ (Payne Smith, col. 1681) says expressly ܡܕܒܠܬܐ ܬܗܝ ܢܗܝܐ ܕܡܕܒܠܬܐ. Our text is an exact translation of the Greek *πρὶν ἐγγίῃαι τοῖς χόμασι*.

p. 4: 1. 3, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ; note b, read ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ.

p. 5: 1. 2, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 3, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ; delete note b, and cf. Payne Smith, col. 1705. 1. 13, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 15, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ, also 6:3. 1. 18, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ.

p. 6: 1. 4: The manuscript reading is correct. Wau introduces the apodosis of the sentence commencing with ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 9, after ܡܕܒܠܬܐ MS. adds ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 11, the text is correct. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ = *οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην*. See Payne Smith, col. 479. 1. 14, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ; delete note f, and cf. 6:4.

p. 7: 1. 7, read as in note a. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ = *τοὺς ἀλκίμους*. 1. 8, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 15, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ.

p. 8: 1. 1, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 2, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ to distinguish it from ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 12, for the unintelligible ܡܕܒܠܬܐ read with the manuscript ܡܕܒܠܬܐ, which is not to be translated "with few," which would be ܡܕܒܠܬܐ, but "with great speed;" in the same sense as ܡܕܒܠܬܐ is used; see Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, ed. W. Wright, 56:24, Jes. 5:26; Knös, *Chrestomathia Syriaca*, p. 70; Wright, *Contributions to the Apoc. Lit. of the N. T.*, 31:23; or "suddenly," 'Aprêm, I., 74 D. 1. 15, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 17, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. We must undoubtedly read ܡܕܒܠܬܐ, although the manuscript reading is ܡܕܒܠܬܐ, Greek *μετὰ τοιούτων ὁπλων*. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ is omitted in Dr. Kottek's translation and in the Greek; but curiously enough, is found again in Whiston's translation. 1. 18, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 19, read ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 21, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ, also 9:2. 1. 22, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ.

p. 9: 1. 3, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 7, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 17, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. For the use of this form for ܡܕܒܠܬܐ see Wright, *The Homilies of Aphraates*, I. list of errata. MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. 1. 18, MS. ܡܕܒܠܬܐ. Read ܡܕܒܠܬܐ as in manuscript. For the meaning "commence" see Bernstein's *Lexicon to his Chrestomathy*, p. 547.

p. 10: 1. 1, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ. 1. 2, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 3, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 22, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 23, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ.

p. 11: 1. 3, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 6: The text here is in perfect order. I see no necessity whatever for adding ܡܚܝܠܐ. Such constructions (where the subject is repeated by a possessive pronoun) occur often in Syriac (Nöldeke, *Syrische Gram.*, § 317), as in other Semitic dialects. Cf. ܡܚܝܠܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ Nöldeke, *Mandäische Gram.*, § 275, p. 409; Caspari-Müller, *Arab. Gram.*, § 485. For the intransitive use of ܡܚܝܠܐ see Payne Smith, col. 1739. 1. 7, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 8, after ܡܚܝܠܐ MS. reads ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ as proposed in note c. 1. 10: Here too the text, although paraphrasing the original, is correct. The MS. shows a point after ܡܚܝܠܐ, indicating that this word is not to be construed with the next one, but with the preceding. I hardly see how Dr. Kottek could translate this sentence as he has. ܡܚܝܠܐ is never construed with ܡܚܝܠܐ. Waving the question raised in note d, whether ܡܚܝܠܐ can have the meaning "envy," as the text stands, we can only take ܡܚܝܠܐ as the plural fem. of ܡܚܝܠܐ (for this form of the adjective used as a noun see Nöldeke, *Mand. Gram.*, § 215 a, p. 299) that which is stable, firm, Castell-Michaelis, p. 969; Bernstein, *Lexicon*, p. 369. Cf. ܡܚܝܠܐ two lines lower down (Bernstein, *loc. cit.*, 570; Hoffmann, *De hermeneuticis apud Syros Aristoteleis*, 216:11 seq., ܡܚܝܠܐ, Wright, *Catalogue*, 506 b.

p. 12: 1. 1, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 6: The text is here in order. ܡܚܝܠܐ refers to ܡܚܝܠܐ (for similar constructions see 3:1; 13:6); ܡܚܝܠܐ = ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ.

p. 13: 1. 4, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ.

p. 14: 1. 3, read ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 9, read ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 15, MS. reads ܡܚܝܠܐ in place of ܡܚܝܠܐ, and vice versa.

p. 15: 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ in place of ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 17, MS. ܡܚܝܠܐ. 1. 20, manuscript reads ܡܚܝܠܐ, which I have met with only in the meaning "angustia, tristitia;" Castell-Michaelis, 642; Bernstein, 366; Hoffmann, *De hermeneuticis*, 196:31, "morbis lethalis," 'Aphrem, II., 83 D, 84 C; "periculum morbis," *ibid.*, 96 b. Dr. Kottek is right in reading ܡܚܝܠܐ (18:4; 29:14), Greek βούλη. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, III., 205:15; Lagarde,

*Analecta Syriaca*, 119:22, 24; Castell-Michaelis gives قَكْد as the plural. Read قَكْد, Bernstein, p. 366; Duval *Grammaire Syriaque*, p. 260; Bar 'Ebhryâ, Grammar (ed. Martin), I., 32:4,

p. 16: 1. 1, MS. ܥܬܐ, 1. 8, manuscript has the wrong reading ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܐܬܪܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܠܐ. I suppose that 'Αρσίμων (Josî-phôn ben Gorion, ed. Breithaupt, 1710, p. 821, has ארשימון) is some old corruption of 'Ιαείρος + Σίμων.

p. 17: 1. 1, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 2, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 3, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܐܬܪܐ. 1. 9, MS. reads ܡܬܠܬܐ! 1. 14, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ.

p. 18: 1. 12, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 22, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ.

p. 19: 1. 2: The change of ܠܡܬܐ into ܠܡܬܐ is unnecessary, although I know of no such use of the word. It is guaranteed by p. 17:5. 1. 7, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܡܬܠܬܐ.

p. 20: 1. 1: I read the first word ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 2: The addition of ܡܬܠܬܐ is unnecessary; Payne Smith, col. 479. 1. 3, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ is correct. I fail to see in what way the proposed emendation would better the text. "And another Bar Mattai" clearly distinguishes him from the four sons of the other of the same name. 1. 9, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ.

p. 21: 1. 1, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ, i. e., ܚܚܝܬܐ, to distinguish it from ܚܚܝܬܐ. 'Ebhdkhos (private manuscript of Professor Sachau, Berlin), fol. 55 a; ܚܚܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܬܐ; ܚܚܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܬܐ. 1. 2, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ; in note *a* read ܚܚܝܬܐ for ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 9, delete point after ܚܚܝܬܐ; read ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 15, in the MS. the traces of the S'yâmê points over ܚܚܝܬܐ are still to be seen.

p. 22: 1. 1, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 12: Omit the unintelligible Dâlath of ܚܚܝܬܐ; it is not in the MS.

p. 23: 1. 3, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 4, read ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. So 1. 12.

p. 24: 1. 3, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ.

p. 25: 1. 4, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 7, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 15, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. reads ܚܚܝܬܐ after the word ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 21, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ.

p. 26: 1. 2, read ܚܚܝܬܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ, compare 1. 7. 1. 7, MS. ܚܚܝܬܐ, i. e.,

ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 8, read ܒܕܢܐ, Duval, *Gram. Syr.*, p. 125. Bar 'Ebhrâyâ, *Gram.* I. 26:25. Read ܒܕܢܐ [ܒܕܢܐ] ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܒܕܢܐ.

p. 27: 1. 1, MS. ܒܕܢܐ. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gram.*, § 239. 1. 2, in the MS. I see the traces of a bê(i)th before ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܒܕܢܐ. This mistake between Dâlath and Rîš occurs often in the Syriac Bible; compare cases such as ܒܕܢܐ, ܒܕܢܐ, Gen. II. 12; ܒܕܢܐ, 1 Chron. XI. 47; ܒܕܢܐ, Gen. IV. 18; ܒܕܢܐ, Gen. X. 3; ܒܕܢܐ, Gen. X. 7; ܒܕܢܐ, Gen. X. 19; ܒܕܢܐ, Gen. X. 22; ܒܕܢܐ, XIV. 1; ܒܕܢܐ, *ibid.*; ܒܕܢܐ, XXII. 22. Bar 'Ebhrâyâ, in his 'auṣar ('râzê, reads ܒܕܢܐ *ibid.*; ܒܕܢܐ, XXV. 3; ܒܕܢܐ, XXV. 14; ܒܕܢܐ, XXVI. 1; *ZDMG.* XXXI. 317. Perles: *Melemata Peschittoniana*, p. 19. 1. 16, MS. ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܒܕܢܐ, read ܒܕܢܐ.

p. 28: 1. 5, MS. ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 7, MS. ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 11, read ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 13, the incorrect reading ܒܕܢܐ has been caused by the occurrence of the word in the next line. MS. ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 18, MS. reads ܒܕܢܐ, as proposed in note b. What follows in the MS. I cannot make out. The three points do not indicate a gap. The following word gives no sense. Nor can the middle letter be a Semkath, as no MSS. of this age which have come under my notice show this letter bound to the next one on the left side. See Wright: *The Homilies of Aphraates*, p. 15, note. ܒܕܢܐ does not, in any case, belong here. 1. 20, Dr. Kotték's emendation will not hold, as ܒܕܢܐ is unnecessary. Read ܒܕܢܐ = μέγα, and translate "is no great thing."

p. 29: 1. 5, MS. ܒܕܢܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܒܕܢܐ.

So much for the text. As regards the German translation, I am sorry that I am not able to speak more favorably. The translation of an Oriental text may be of use in either of two ways. It may assist the Orientalist in understanding a difficult passage, and in getting at the exact meaning of a certain word. It may, however, furnish the non-Orientalist with a faithful picture of what the original text offers. In either case, exactness is demanded, even at the expense of style, as Gildermeisten has done, *Rheinisches Museum*, XXVII., pp. 525 seq. It is true, Dr. Kotték intended to offer us "as literal a translation as possible" (p. 16). I do not think he has been successful in carrying out his intention. At times he has allowed himself to be led astray by the Greek "translation," in face of the plain sense of the Syriac, viz., p. 4:13, the word r(h)ômâyê is omitted as in the Greek; p. 4:18, s'ghâ is translated "surround" (φράσσω), with which meaning I have never met; p. 21, l. 9, "The former bad the rebels in the presence of the Romans;"—the second clause being the Greek καὶ πρὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἰστάμενοι, which is omitted in the Syriac. In a translation it is often necessary to add a word or two to render the sense of the original clear. Such additions should invariably be put in brackets.



See transl. p. 18, l. 11: "would be compelled to lament;" p. 19, l. 1: "for;" l. 11: "they asked themselves;" p. 21, l. 13: "although the Roman;" p. 22, l. 1: "individualities." Dr. Kottek has not seen that it is but an awkward rendering of the Greek διέτεθη τὰ φρονήματα. P. 36, l. 4: "naturally;" l. 6: "in truth," etc. A number of passages are insufficiently—some incorrectly—translated. I will only notice a few instances; e. g., p. 1, l. 4 "aufreiben," instead of some such word as "consume" (Gr. νέμω). Dr. Kottek, it seems, has understood the word r'â in the sense of ra'; l. 7, damkârbin (h)wau 'amhôn means "those who fought with them" τοῖς μαχομένοις, and not "those who fought with one another (baḥ'dhâdhê); l. 12 is translated: "reviled their enemies, and went courageously to battle with them." I do not know on what authority Dr. Kottek gives k'lâ this meaning. We must translate: "they derided (maklê(i)n) [the idea of] fighting with their enemies." For k'lâ with 'al in this meaning see 29:10, where the whole construction is very similar; 'Aph'el, Bar 'Ebhârâ, 'Auṣar (')Râzê to Gen. XII. 4; Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, p. 63; Michaelis (Cast.-Mich., p. 798) doubts that the root k'lâ has this meaning. But see the examples quoted above, and compare Levy TW. II., p. 362. P. 3, l. 12 must be translated: "nor their courage shaken by their suffering" ἀνάλωτον δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ συμφοραῖς ἐνθυμίαν εἶναι. What follows is also badly translated. It is an awkward rendering of the Greek, and must read: "for what would they not enjoy [favored] with good fortune—δεξιᾶ τυχῶν—who, through evil, are led to valor" taknâith = πρὸς ἀλκὴν. The root t'kan is often used in this more ethical sense. Compare 'abhdê taknê 'Aprêm I. 395 A. 272 C.; dubbârê taknê Wright, *Catalogue*, 573b; Eusebius, on *Theophania* II. c. 71; Bernstein, *Lexicon*, p. 570. taknâith Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, p. 70. This makes note 5 on p. 19 trans. unnecessary, as also the addition in the text of "they asked themselves." L. 18, translate "the Jews sought to hinder them in their works;" l. 20, "and before they came near to the banks their hopes were blighted," reading 'adh and tukhlâthhôn. Ψυχρότεροι πῆς ἐλπίδος; compare tukhlânâ, 7:15; p. 4, l. 1, supply "but;" l. 4, the text reads w'men, where the Waw does not seem to be in the right place; p. 20, trans. note 4 is wrong. 'en hâlê(i)n nezkyân l'dhîlhôn = εἰ πάντα κρατήσκειαν; *ibid.*, note 5, read: "wanting in the Syriac;" p. 7, l. 12, "and that the ascent of the wall is difficult, I am the first to say to you;" l. 15, "the good fruits of bravery" belongs to the preceding sentence. In the MS. there is a point after d'hallîsûthâ. Translate: "and first let the hope for a proper commencement—do you not be withheld [by this argument (a free rendering of τὸ τινὰς ἰσως ἀποτρίπον)]—come to you from the perseverance of the Jews;" *ibid.* note a must be omitted, Nöldeke, § 24; p. 9, l. 11, read w'kallîl; p. 10, l. 11, "of those, however, who were in the cohort, one did service, by name Sabinus." Dr. Kottek seems to have read pâlhîn, which would agree with the Greek στρατευομένων; l. 19, the translation "that my power and good-will follow upon thy victory" gives no sense. Unless the Syriac translator has taken n'mann'ôn bâthar as equivalent to the Greek ἀπὸ κολουθήσαι, we must read: d'bhâthar hail(i) w'sebhyâ-

n(i) n'mann'ôn sâkhôthâkh. Whiston translates "my fortune;" with what authority, I do not know. The received text has σὴν. P. 12, l. 9, "as if through some evil genius" â(i)kh d'men = ἀναλόγως? : p. 13, l. 14, I would emend the text in the following way : šuryâ (h)wâ lakrâbhâ bh'ma'elânâ takkîphâith ; p. 15, l. 4, "a man whom I had seen in the war" ὃν ἐγὼ κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἰσθόρησα τὸν πόλεμον ; p. 15, l. 19, "fell upon his side;" p. 16, l. 1, the fifth, sixth and seventh words seem to be out of place, and to belong to the second line, which would then read : w'men yûkârêh d'zainâ lâ 'eškakh. P. 16, l. 5, Dr. Kotték gives the curious translation : "lost his courage" instead of "his soul expired," i. e., he gave up the ghost. Compare an exactly similar expression, Wright : *Contributions to the apocryphal Literature*, 56:4; Zunz : *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogen Poesie*, p. 641. The word naphšâ is generally omitted, Mark xv. 3 ; 2 Macc. i. 7, 13 (Cast.-Mich.). P. 17, l. 4, the translation "On the 17th of Tamus [read Tammûz] all the people were humiliated" is impossible. Dr. Kotték seems to have read gurgâyê, a word which seldom occurs in Syriac literature, Payne Smith, col. 774. If the text reading—gurâghâ—is right, we must translate : "there was an excitement on account of the [scarcity of] people." I regard as doubtful, however, the MS. reading, which ought probably to be some word corresponding to the Greek ἀπορία ; p. 17, l. 9, Dr. Kotték entirely ignores the word lêh. Translate : "The offerings should be allowed him (i. e., it should be allowed him to bring offerings) with the aid (b'yadh) of such Jews as he should select for himself;" l. 13, lam'sâph "to consume it;" p. 18, l. 14, 'en is omitted in the translation, which should read "seeing that foreign nations," and should be connected with the foregoing. "But you" commences a new sentence ; l. 22, "bore captivity." P. 19, l. 13, k'bhar not "perhaps," but "already, now," Gr. ἄρα ; p. 20, l. 16, "cheerfully" is omitted in the translation ; Gr. ἀσμέντοι ; p. 22, l. 1, the text here is very difficult to understand. Dr. Kotték's translation gives no sense. Some emendation is necessary. If in lines 3 and 4 we change the places of r(h)ômâyê and yûdhâyê respectively, we get a sense approaching the Greek original : "and [indeed] so far did all their wickedness [reach]—men who should, by rights, have been plunged into sorrow and grief, if one of the Romans had shown the intention ('emar) of desecrating (n'awwel and not ne'ôl, as Dr. Kotték takes it. ἐξυθρίζουεν, compare 17:9 trans. p. 37, note 6) their (the Jews') sanctuary—[that], because the Jews were [steeped] in such wickedness, the Romans themselves commenced to despise [them]." P. 23, l. 8, s'kubhlâ "opposition;" p. 25, l. 25. It has been entirely misunderstood, and has unnecessarily occasioned note 1, p. 41, trans. If we make one or two emendations, the Syriac text corresponds exactly with the Greek. The word rê'sâ 25:23 ought to have shown the way. We must read 25:23 dh'khudhnawâthâ ; 26:1 wath'rênâyâ men 'akhsedra dhê(i)n garb'yaitâ dh'ithêh "so that they raised the foremost one of the banks over against that corner of the inner court which [looked] to the north-west, a second one against the northern edifice, which was between its two gates. The other two were at the





וְשָׁבָה . שָׁמַרְתָּ וּשְׁמַרְתָּ חֶזְקָה לְהָאֵלָהּ . וְכֵן וְשָׁמַרְתָּ חֶזְקָה לְהָאֵלָהּ .  
 אִם אֵל לֹא יִשְׁמָרְךָ .<sup>1</sup> מִצָּרְךָ חֵן וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . מִצָּרְךָ חֵן וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .<sup>2</sup> אִם  
 לֹא יִשְׁמָרְךָ .<sup>3</sup> כִּי שָׁמַרְתָּ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .<sup>4</sup>  
 חֶזְקָתְךָ .<sup>5</sup> שָׁמַרְתָּ לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .<sup>6</sup>  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .<sup>7</sup> וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .

Bk. V., 10:5 = Eusebius *Theophania*, IV., 22.

וְלֹא יִשְׁמָרְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .

In Ceriani's Hexapla, p. 112 b, note, I find the following:

וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .  
 וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ . וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ .

<sup>1</sup> B אִם אֵל לֹא יִשְׁמָרְךָ

<sup>2</sup> B וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ A follows here the Greek text more closely.

<sup>3</sup> B וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ

<sup>4</sup> Wanting in B.

<sup>5</sup> B וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ

<sup>6</sup> B וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ

<sup>7</sup> B וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ with following וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ

<sup>8</sup> συνελόντα δ' εἰπεῖν.

<sup>9</sup> The next four lines are wanting in the Syriac.

<sup>10</sup> Some such word as nûrâ seems to have been omitted here = τὸ πῦρ.

<sup>11</sup> The Greek text has here the temple and not the fire as object.

<sup>12</sup> Ἰουδαϊκῇ ἀρχαιολογία. Bk. IX., ch. X., § 4.

<sup>13</sup> Gr. Ἀζάριον.

<sup>14</sup> As the Syriac cannot use bainâth alone, hâlê(i)n is added. Over the word dê(i)n are three points, which generally are a sign that the word is to be omitted. Here, however, dê(i)n stands for the Greek δὲ.

<sup>15</sup> Pa"el, indicated by the point above, = ἐκλόνησε . . . μέγας.

<sup>16</sup> Read וְכֵן לְחֶזְקָתְךָ (וְכֵן = φέγγος, וְכֵן = λαμπρόν. Payne Smith, cols. 1125, 2438).



3:15; men kulhôn, 4:5 = πάντων; šabhkê, 4:16 = ἀφετήρια. If the following words of the text are correct,—perhaps we ought to read hânôn,—they are a poor rendering of the Greek τῶν προστηδόντων. 'adh nê'thê...k'râbhâ l'idhaihôn, p. 5, l. 2 = εἰς χεῖρας ἐλθεῖν; nettebh 'al š'wârôn, p. 8, l. 21. Dr. Kotték affirms (preface, p. 15) that there occur in the translation many words which are only to be found again in the Aramaic—by which, I suppose, he means the dialects of the Targumîm and Talmûdhîm. I have been unable to find such, and am sorry that Dr. Kotték has so limited the number which he himself quotes. And even these three vanish, when looked at a little closer. The word š'bhaḳ, "permit" does occur in Syriac, Mark i. 34, w'lâ šâbheḳ (h)wâ l'hôn. This passage, as well as the others cited Cast.-Mich. p. 888, s. v. šâbhôkâ, belong under the rubric š'bhaḳ. Bernstein, *Lexicon*, p. 500. For the 'Ethp'el in the same meaning, Hahn and Sieffert, *Chrestomathia Syriaca* (1825), p. 224. For k'nâ "envy," Dr. Kotték could have cited, in support of his theory, its occurrence in Christian Palestinian Aramaic (Franciscus Miniscalchi Erizzo, *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*, etc., p. 393). My collections for Syriac lexicography do not contain the word in that meaning in Edessénian Syriac. k'nê'thâ, Job v. 2 (Bernstein, p. 449) is simply the Hebrew kîn'âh. Dr. Kotték would, however, have done better to have left this word out of his argument, as it rests (p. 11, l. 10 and note d) on the very slender basis of conjecture and emendation. I have shown above how untenable both are. Compare also 18:15. The form of the root gûph, 24:11 (not gaph, as Dr. Kotték has it) can as well be read m'ghayy'phîn in Pa'el, for which Payne Smith, col. 687, gives one authority. The Targumîm seem also to use this word as an 'Ayîn-U one. Levy, TW., I., 131 (the place to which Dr. Kotték refers) gives gûph.

If the external arguments fail thus to support the theory propounded, so do the internal ones taken from a comparison of the Syriac with the Greek text. From a consideration of the general character of the text, very little can be won. Few of the translations from the Greek—if we except those of the Aristotelian Canon—keep closely to their original. Few translators are as conscientious as Sargîs Rîš'ainâyâ (Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, p. 134:23 seq.). On the contrary, they seek rather to give only the meaning conveyed by their originals. On this point, Licentiat Ryssel has summed up the evidence in his two excellent essays, *Ueber den text-kritischen Werth der Syrischen Uebersetzungen Griechischer Klassiker*, I., II. Leipzig, 1880.

Our translation of Josephus belongs to the second of the three divisions of Ryssel (I., p. 4). But this would surely be no reason (Kotték, preface, p. 9) to doubt its having a Greek original. The other arguments might be noticed here. ch. 1, § 5: If we accept the very probable conjecture of Dr. Kotték himself, both texts will agree. § 5: The opening sentences of the speech, as it stands in the Syriac version, seem to me more in accord with what has preceded than in the Greek. Josephus says expressly that Titus was of the opinion that "exhortations

and promises would strengthen the courage of his soldiers." ch. IV. § 1: I have not the Syriac text at hand; though I doubt whether there is any real difference between it and the Greek. I understand the Syriac to mean that the Romans first weakened and partly demolished the gate, and then applied ladders and fire. ch. 5. § 3: The Syriac translator has simply blundered here, having been led astray by the preceding mention of the night of the festival. In the same way, many of the "additions" (as 3:10; 5:13) can be explained as omissions on the part of the Syriac translator. On the whole, he seems to strive after conciseness of expression, ch. 2: 3, n. 2; ch. 3:1. In ch. 1, § 6, note 3, *ὁρμη τινι δαμονίῳ* did not suit the Christian Syrian; for which reason he altered it. Ryssel, *loc. cit.*, I., 4; II., 50. To the same category belong the changes in ch. 2, § 4, note 3, ch. 2, § 10, Pudens succumbs to Jonathan rather than to chance. See ch. 1, § 1, note 6, § 8, note 1. *οὐκ ἄσσημος ἦν ἀνὴρ* is omitted as not necessary for the sense; *ibid.* note 9, it is only the first five words which are left out in the Syriac. The translator did not deem it necessary to add these words, as the fact is easily understood from the narrative itself.

It may be permitted me to call attention to some lexicographical points which I have noticed while reading the text. 1:10 m'phalpal in the sense of "stained" *φύρω*. Hex. Jerem. 2:3 (Cast.-Mich.); Bar 'Alî ed. Hoffmann, 228:7; Payne Smith, col. 1504; 'Aprêm I., 205 A. Compare farther on 21:18, where it is a translation *ad sensum* of *θερμάς τὰς χεῖρας ἔχοντες*; 29:10 in the meaning of the German "wälzen" (*Sindban*, ed. Baethgen, 9:10); Targûmish כָּלַל (Levy, TW., II., 271). p. 2, l. 2, d'lâ bhûnââ = ἀπόγνωσις "desperation" (to be added Payne Smith, col. 469). p. 2, l. 4, kudhnawâthâ. Payne Smith, col. 1181, has a remark on this passage. p. 2, l. 9, tašb'yâthâ. Jer. 2:32, 4:30; 'Aprêm I., 345 D; *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 26:16, 48:3. In the same sense sebhtâ, l. 12; Eusebius, *Theophania*, I., 4:1; Jes. 3:18; Hoffmann, *de hermeneuticis*, 203:27. Curious is the use of nestakbal. p. 2, l. 12, "arrive, come to." Levy TW., II., 185. p. 14, l. 15 it has its usual signification. p. 3, l. 3, t'hebbh, of which the P'al is not given. Cast.-Mich. p. 936; see ZDMG., XXIV., 268:25; Bar 'Ebhrâyâ to Jes. 19:2, Tullberg 14, note p. 12; Dionysius Telmahrensensis 117:8, note, p. 303; Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, p. 69 s. v. p. 4, l. 1, 'ethpakkah; 29:16. Bickell, *loc. cit.* p. 60, 'Ebhdokhos (private MS. of Prof. Sachau, Berlin) fol. 26a. *إِبْجَحْه خَفْضُهُبَا . مِنْ السَّاج . إِبْجَحْه (!) كَد*. in the meaning "pacare," 'Aprêm, II., 242 C; "temperare," *ibid.* I., 10 A, 16, 5 C; *Spic. Syr.*, 21:3. p. 5, l. 19, *سَعْدِيْه* (sic) 24:11; *سَعْدِيْه* "scutus"? p. 8, l. 3, šu'lâyâ, "superbia." 'Aprêm, II., 119 D, 124 F; I., 339 E. p. 10, l. 2, šuph'an, "profusio." l. 15, šiyûthâ, "color of the face," where the masc. 'ukkâmâ next to h'wâth is strange. Nöldeke, ZDMG., XXXVII., 535, note 1. The citation from Titus of Bostra is a slip of the pen, as the word mentioned there is šanyûthâ. 'Ebhdokhos also gives the pronunciation as trisyllabic (fol. 137 b). *مِبْطَا سَ قَ أَقَا* with the marginal



note **سند الحسنة الجميلة** **ס** p. 11, l. 4, m<sup>e</sup>arg'lin "roll." Prov. XVI. 3; Hex. MS. or. Berl. Petermann, 1:19 (Sachau, *Kurzes Verzeichniss der Sachau'schen Sammlung*, p. 34, No. 49:4). **كَنْهَكَ مَحْنِيكَ مَعْ حَنْفِلَا عَفْ فَرْزَلْ مَرْجْ** 'Ethpa, "roll oneself." *Spic. Syr.*, 27:25; **ערגל** Levy, TW., II., 243. p. 13, l. 7, ḥal, "dig," add to Payne Smith, col. 1268. **دُرْتَهْ**, "lances," 14:4, Payne Smith, col. 858. I think that the Greek **δόρυ, δόρατος (δοῦρατος)** is in this word. p. 5, l. 4; 15, l. 22, **šâphyê**, Bernstein, *Lexicon*, 530. Bar 'Alî (private MS. of Prof. Sachau in Berlin). **مَعْتَا سَ نَيَّا سَمِئَلَا بِخَاجِبِ صِيصَا . حَدِيدَ الَّذِي يَدْخُلُ فِي الْكَم . سَم**  
**بَامْخَمَرْ حَدْ مَقْلَا خَصْمَهْ** (2 Cor. XII. 7) **يَكْرَزْ (?) لِي الْإِشْفَا الْبَعْدَب** p. 17:12, math'em (?)—of which I do not know the meaning. Dr. Kottek, in his translation, has mistaken Castell's (p. 948) "gemino" for "gemo." Bar 'Alî, ed. Hoffmann, 269:25 seq. p. 23, l. 3, šammar, "send," 'Aprêm, I., 517 F, etc. p. 24, l. 5, methdag-g'sîn = 'adhgeš, Payne Smith, col. 823. p. 24, l. 14, yulpâ'nâ. p. 26, l. 4, t'âšâ "labor." 'Aprêm, II., 118 A; I., 195 F, 420 F; Elias of Tirhân, 3:10.

There are other matters to which I would gladly call attention; but I have already gone beyond the limits I had placed for myself. In conclusion, I can only hope that Dr. Kottek may soon be able to give us the rest of this interesting translation—perhaps, too, in a little better form.